

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE 11/25/2003		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Thomas P. Jerussi	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,134				4821-531-999	4423
20582 JONES DAY	7590	07/05/2007		EXAMINER	
222 East 41st 5		700	ZUCKER, PAUL	PAUL A	
New York, NY	New York, NY 10017-6702			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•				1621	
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
				07/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/720,134	JERUSSI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Paul A. Zucker	1621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (1.136(a). In no event, however, may a root will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ute, cause the application to become AE	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03	<i>May 2007</i> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	o. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 60-78 is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) 72-78 is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 60-71 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 60-78 are subject to restriction and	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to ne drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/23/04,11/25/03,1/18/06.	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 				

Application/Control Number: 10/720,134 Page 2

Art Unit: 1621

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 60-71, in the reply filed on 3 May 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search of O-desmethyylvenlafaxine succinate will necessarily encompass the subject matter of both groups I and II. This is not found persuasive because Groups I and II comprise patentably distinct subject matter which each require search that is non-coextensive with that required for the other. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claims 72-78 are held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art:
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- Claims 60-66 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Husbands (US 4,535,186 08-1985 08-1985).

Art Unit: 1621

Instantly claimed is O-desmethylvenlafaxine succinate and compositions thereof.

Husbands teaches (Column 19, lines 1-22) the synthesis of the compound Odesmethylvenlafaxine fumarate. Husbands teaches (Column 10, lines 31-61) pharmaceutical compositions, oral dosage forms such as tablets and aqueous solutions.

The difference between the instantly claims and Husbands is that Husbands does not specifically exemplify O-desmethylvenlafaxine succinate.

Husbands, however, further teaches (Column 2, lines 39-46) the equivalence of the fumaric acid and succinic acid salts. Husbands thereby suggests the substitution of the succinate counterion for the exemplified fumarate. The corresponding hydrates would inherently form upon exposure to ambient humidity or in aqueous solution.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Husbands to make the instantly claimed compound. Because of that suggestion there would have been a reasonable expectation for success. The instantly claimed O-desmethylvenlafaxine succinate is therefore prima facie obvious over the teachings of Husbands.

Thus the instantly claimed compound and compositions would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit; 1621

3. Claims 67-59 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Husbands (US 4,535,186 08-1985 08-1985) as applied to claims 60-66 and 70 above, and further in view of Sherman et al (US 6,274,171 08-2001).

Instantly claimed are sustained-release formulations of O-desmethylvenlafaxine succinate.

The difference between the teachings of Husbands and the instant claims is that Husbands does not contemplate the use of extended release formulations of Odesmethylvenlafaxine succinate while such are instantly claimed.

Sherman, however, teaches (Abstract) extended release formulations of venlafaxine hydrochloride. Sherman teaches (Column 3, lines 17-27) extended release formulations of venlafaxine and microcrystalline cellulose which the examiner considers a rate-determining polymer comprising monomeric glucose units.

Sherman teaches (Column 12, lines 29-36, claim 17) coatings of hydroxypropylmethyl cellulose as well.

Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have used the formulations of Sherman to produce more consistent blood concentrations of O-desmethylvenlafaxine succinate. Since such techniques are standard in the art there would have been a reasonable expectation for success.

Thus the instantly claimed compositions would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 1621

Claim Objections

4. Claim 69 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "hydroxypropylmethylcellulose" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Conclusion

5. Claims 60-78 are pending. Claims 60- 71 are rejected. Claim 69 is objected to.

Claims 72-78 are held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul A. Zucker whose telephone number is 571-272-0650. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 5:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Evonne Eyler can be reached on 571-272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul A. Zucker Primary Examiner Art Unit 1621 Page 6